UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,334	01/30/2004	Kensuke Komatsu	P24867	5231
	7590 06/24/200 & BERNSTEIN, P.L. (EXAMINER		
1950 ROLAND	CLARKE PLACE		SOLOLA, TAOFIQ A	
RESTON, VA 20191			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/24/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/767,334	KOMATSU ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Taofiq A. Solola	1625		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from (6), cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 A</u> 2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ This 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under B.	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	wn from consideration. or election requirement. er. cepted or b) □ objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>na</u> .	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D: 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number: 10/767,334 Page 2

Art Unit: 1625

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application.

Restriction Requirement

The election of group II, claims 1-11, formulae IB to IIIB, with traverse in the Paper filed 3/28/08 is hereby acknowledged. The traversal is on the basis that "an appropriate explanation" was not provided and because it would not be a "serious burden" on the Examiner to search all the groups. This is not persuasive for reason set forth in the Restriction Requirement and because it would in fact be a serious burden on the Examiner to search all the groups.

Therefore, claims 1-11 are being examined in part according to the election by applicant.

The restriction is still deemed proper and therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2-4, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Formula IIB is confusing and therefore claims 2-4 are indefinite. When r is 0, N must have a double bond. However, there is no acknowledgement of the double bond in the specification or claim, and its position is not identified.

Claim 10 improperly depends from claim 8, and therefore is indefinite. Claim 10 is drawn to a kit while 8 is drawn to a method for measuring zinc ions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagano et al., EP 1 260 510 A1.

Nagano et al., disclose fluorescein compounds of formula (IB) composition and method of use for detecting zinc ions. See page 4, [0005] to page 7, [0012].

The compounds have few substituents (e.g. R1-R4, R6-R7) each of which are very limited, there are no alternative points of attachments of the substituent to the central structures, and the central structures do not change. Therefore, Nagano et al., have described to those of ordinary skill in [the] art each of the various permutations involved . . . as fully as if [they] had drawn each structural formula or had written each name." *In re Petering,* 133 USPQ 275 (CCPA 1962).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano et al., EP 1 260 510 A1.

Applicant claims compounds of formulae IB-IIIB, their complex with zinc ions and method of use for detecting zinc ions. In preferred embodiment, applicant claims a kit comprising the compounds.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP ∋2141.01

Nagano et al., teach compounds IB-IIIB, and their method of use for detecting zinc ions. See page 4, [0005] to page 7, [0012].

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP ∋2141.02)

The difference between the instant invention and that of Nagano et al., is that applicant selects some of the compounds by Nagano et al. Applicant also replaces H with methyl at position R15 or R16 of compound IIB.

Finding of prima facie obviousness--rational and motivation (MPEP 32142.2413)

However, the selection of some among many is prima facie obvious. *In re Lemin,* 141 USPQ 814 (1964).

Also, H and alkyl are art recognized equivalents. *In re Lincoln*, 126 USPQ 477, 53 USPQ 40 (CCPA, 1942); *In re Druey*, 319 F.2d 237, 138 USPQ 39 (CCPA, 1963); *In re Lohr*, 317 F.2d 388, 137 USPQ 548 (CCPA, 1963); *In re Hoehsema*, 399 F.2d 269, 158 USPQ 598 (CCPA, 1968); *In re Wood*, 582 F.2d 638, 199 USPQ 137 (CCPA, 1978); *In re Hoke*, 560 F.2d 436, 195 USPQ 148 (CCPA, 1977); *Ex parte Fauque*, 121 USPQ 425 (POBA, 1954); *Ex parte Henkel*, 130 USPQ 474, (POBA, 1960).

Having the compounds in a kit is an obvious modification available to the preference of an artisan.

Therefore, the instant invention is prima facie obvious from the teaching of Nagano et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to replace H with alkyl in the compound of Nagano et al., and select some of the compounds at the time this invention was made. The motivation is from knowing that H and alkyl are equivalents and to select the best/leading compounds.

Art Unit: 1625

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taofiq A. Solola, PhD. JD., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0709.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

/Taofiq A. Solola/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

June 17, 2008